

JUN 29 2012

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>LAWRENCE RAY MALONDA,</p> <p>Petitioner,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER, Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p>Respondent.</p>

No. 10-71202

Agency No. A078-442-403

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted June 26, 2012 **

Before: SCHROEDER, HAWKINS, and GOULD, Circuit Judges.

Lawrence Ray Malonda, a native and citizen of Indonesia, petitions for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals’ (“BIA”) order dismissing his appeal from an immigration judge’s decision denying his application for withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review for substantial

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

evidence, *Wakkary v. Holder*, 558 F.3d 1049, 1056 (9th Cir. 2009), and we deny the petition for review.

Substantial evidence supports the BIA’s determination that Malonda did not experience harms in Indonesia that rise to the level of past persecution. *See Halim v. Holder*, 590 F.3d 971, 975-76 (9th Cir. 2009). In addition, substantial evidence supports the BIA’s determination that, even under a disfavored group analysis, Malonda did not demonstrate sufficient individualized risk to establish a clear probability of persecution, *see Hoxha v. Ashcroft*, 319 F.3d 1179, 1185 (9th Cir. 2003); *Wakkary*, 558 F.3d at 1066 (“[a]n applicant for withholding of removal will need to adduce a considerably larger quantum of individualized-risk evidence”), and did not demonstrate there is a pattern or practice of persecution against Chinese Christians in Indonesia, *see Wakkary*, 558 F.3d at 1060-62. Accordingly, Malonda’s withholding of removal claim fails.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.